

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #388
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 23 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 388

Today's Topics:

100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination (2 msgs)
 CW Poll Addendum
 FLAME the FCC

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 Aug 1994 14:33:43 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!Starbase.NeoSoft.COM!
nobody@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33atdm\$se6@agate.berkeley.edu>,
Ken A. Nishimura <kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU> wrote:
>I ask this to determine what the community thinks, and to see
>whether these scenarios occur in various parts of the country.

I can't speak to what happens in your part of the country, but the Texas VHF-
FM Society allows a trustee to transfer a coordination from an individual to
a club, but not between individuals or between clubs and individuals. This is
a one-time deal, and once transferred, that trustee has no further claim to
the coordination.

The idea was to allow a group of users to form a club and transfer the
coordination to the club so the frequency wouldn't go away upon death or other

disappearance of the trustee. There was an instance in Dallas where the trustee was killed in an accident with the power supply in an HF amplifier and the repeater was still operating with the deceased amateur's call. The users of the system formed a club and the estate transferred the trusteeship to the club. Pretty wierd, but it actually happened.

I don't make this stuff up...honest!

>I am NOT a disgruntled wanna-be-repeater owner (I'm going to
>1280), but more or less curious, AND TRYING TO GET THIS GROUP
>OFF OF THE DAMNED CODE WARS.

THANK GOD! I was about ready to unsubscribe... :)

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT		Chief Engineer, KODA Sunny 99.1 FM
jreese@neosoft.com		"Not responsible for program content..."

Date: 22 Aug 1994 22:06:38 GMT
From: george.inhouse.compuserve.com!news.inhouse.compuserve.com!compuserve.com!
news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I would think that anyone who sold a repeater (bundle of equipment) at a price that seems to reflect the value of its coordination would be committing a fraud. That coordination is not an asset and an amateur repeater is not a commercial enterprise. But that, it seems to me, is an issue between the buyer and the seller that should not affect the deliberations of the coordinating body.

You ask a really, really interesting question here, in effect: "What is a repeater?" If I bought a new machine, and in the space of less than a minute changed over the antennas and powered up the new box, I would not expect to start the coordination process as if I were a brand new repeater operation. So the repeater, it seems to me, is not the equipment.

Nor is the repeater the trustee, in the sense of the individual amateur licensee who has that legal role. Changing over a club's trustee, with no other changes, seems as if it should not trigger re-coordination.

It seems to me that since a repeater frequency pair is not property,

but a public good that is administered by an essentially voluntary mechanism, that the process of re-assigning that public good should be triggered by a public process. I would suggest that a coordinating body should have a procedure by which (say) ten or more amateurs should be able to offer written comments that argue for re-coordination of a frequency pair for any of a number of reasons: poor maintenance of an existing repeater, for example, making it unreliable or limited in its coverage, or a changing pattern of use making that repeater redundant with many others offering similar geographic coverage. Such a procedure would suggest that all repeater trustees, like broadcast licensees, would be expected to pay continuing attention to the needs of their region and to keep from becoming complacent about "their" frequencies.

Under what conditions is it obvious that a repeater has "died" and that the frequency coordination process should take place de novo? Good question.

Date: 22 Aug 94 15:18:01 EDT
From: psinntp!main03!drager.com!landisj@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW Poll Addendum
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <462@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

[...]

> 2A) Keep current arrangement (separate element, 13wpm).

Keep it the same.

Joe - AA3GN

--

Joe Landis - System & Network Mgr. - North American Drager Co. Telford, PA
landisj@drager.com | uupsi5!main03!landisj | AA3GN@WA3TSW.#EPA.PA.USA
Opinions are mine only, and do not reflect those of my employer.
...Munging Until No Good...

Date: 22 Aug 1994 22:53:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
cleveland.Freenet.Edu!ek207@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FLAME the FCC
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

On May 15 (yes, this year) my son (17) and I (51) took our no code ham tests. My boy was all fired up to do this since he passed both parts with 100%. I did not do as well but passed anyway.

Well, now 14 weeks later we still do not have our licenses from those

lazy bastards at the FCC. Now I know why DC has so little respect in the hinterlands. As a side not, calling the ARRL does not do much either. They tell you (after many transfers) that your results have been sent to the F...g Clinton Clone board and they do nothing else for you.

Vacation passed where we could have used the radio (car broke down) but nothing so far.

Any one else out there who knows how to get results from FCC never land? And then government workers (an oxymoron) wonder why nobody has respect for them.

Sorry, had to get this off my normally mild mannered chest. I promise to be better next time. :)

--

Bill and Tim Father and Son
Hard core railfans and photographers
No track is safe from us, anywhere, anytime.

Date: 22 Aug 1994 21:14:39 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!qualcomm.com!qualcomm.com!kleing@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <333n3t\$jjqf@nic-nac.CSU.net>, <1994Aug20.140335.9766@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <33aqf0\$gss@eugene.convex.com>
Subject : Re: Questions: Digital Scanning, Cellphones, Transmissions

In article <33aqf0\$gss@eugene.convex.com> horak@convex.com (David Horak) writes:
>In <1994Aug20.140335.9766@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>
>>There are two methods competing for digital cellular. One is based
>>on TDMA, and the other is spread spectrum. Since with SS each phone will
>>Gary
>
>Wouldn't SS be a pain to orchestrate being that cell sites use specific
>frequencies per site or am I missing something here? Are the digital
>phones going to use the same freq spectrum? (~824-849)

Yep, you're missing something. The SS system called IS-95 will use a SS modulation of 1.25 MHz. At first, only a single such wide channel would be used for the CDMA SS system. The analog system would be removed from those channels. Later on, as the proportion of phones shifts toward CDMA capable phones, more bandwidth can be converted to SS

use. Note that CDMA SS allows a single 1.25 MHz bandwidth channel to be used by ALL cells in the system. This is a key aspect of CDMA's higher capacity than other techniques

Klein Gilhousen, WT6G
QUALCOMM Incorporated

Date: Mon, 22 Aug 1994 22:57:29 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug16.215347.24432@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<wyn.132.2E52031B@ornl.gov>, <32t6mh\$fqe@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu>,
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

In article <32t6mh\$fqe@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu> jbalztz@bonjour.cc.columbia.edu (Jerry B Altzman) writes:

>In article <wyn.132.2E52031B@ornl.gov>,
>C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX <wyn@ornl.gov> wrote:
>>>Why is Morse the metric by which all others should be measured?
>>I don't know why. I just know it is. Why is Mt. Everest the peak
>>by which all other mountains are compared? I don't know, it just is.

>Duuh, because Everest is the highest above-water peak on the planet?

I thought K-2 in Pakistan edged out Everest...

Jeff NH6IL
jeffrey@The.Big.Kahuna.hawaii.edu or jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 00:04:25 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!
F181-130.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <082194110312Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<bmicales.237.2E57FDD3@facstaff.wisc.edu>, <082294044922Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

>bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu (Bruce Micales) writes:
===stuff deleted===not needed, and not wanted ===
>Is there a purpose for quoting the above? Just wondering.
Dan, no there is no reason...my mistake..sorry

>>I believe we can thank the ITU for requiring the testing of Morse (>>International). Let us change the ITU.

>Ok, thanks for your support in asking the ARRL to petition the FCC to >move for removal of that requirement from the ITU at the next WARC. I >agree! We will count on your valued support.

WHOA!!! I did not mean that the CW requirement should be removed nor do I support the idea that the CW requirement must be maintained.

What I would like to see is an exam that you must show your operating proficiency in ANY mode that you wish (and that is currently being used in amateur radio). Personally, I like code (not that I am very good at it - 5 wpm), however, you may want SSB, packet, voice, etc.. You would be allowed to select the mode to test your operating proficiency, but not limited to that mode (once you are licensed).

If this is what you are thinking, ok I'll support you. However, complete removal of proof of your operating proficiency I cannot support.

>The ITU requires demonstration of morse proficiency in receiving AND >SENDING. Since we are ignoring half the requirement, I see no reason to >follow the entire thing (After all BOTH parts are the law of the land).

I agree, I am sure there is some legal "loophole" the U.S. government used to get around this. What I do not know.

Bruce Micales

WA2DEU

P.S. I apologize if I have "ruffled" anyones feathers...this is just my humble opinion.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #388
